February 17, 2004

Ms. Melissa L. Barloco Assistant County Attorney Harris County 1019 Congress, 15th Floor Houston, Texas 77002-1700

OR2004-1162

Dear Ms. Barloco:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 196303.

The Harris County Sheriff's Department (the "department") received a request for information concerning complaints or allegations involving department officers Major Carl Borchers, Captain J.G. Brownfield, and Lieutenant Rick Trenski, starting from the officers' dates of hire. You claim that the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

As a preliminary matter, you state that the department has previously released some responsive information concerning Major Borchers and Lieutenant Trenski to the requestor in accordance with the rulings of this office in Open Records Letter Nos. 2003-7778 (2003) and 2003-1596 (2003). Furthermore, you indicate that the facts and circumstances concerning the prior rulings have not changed. Accordingly, to the extent the information at issue in the present request is identical to the information addressed in Open Records Letter Nos. 2003-7778 and 2003-1596 (2003), we determine the department must continue to rely on those rulings as previous determinations with respect to such information. See Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (governmental body may rely on previous determination when 1) the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D); 2) the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; 3) the prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"); and 4) the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling). Consequently, this ruling only addresses the portion of the request seeking information concerning Captain J.G. Brownfield.

We note that the submitted information is subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in relevant part:

the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The information at issue is a completed investigation by the internal affairs division of the department. Therefore, as prescribed by section 552.022(a)(1), the department must release the submitted information unless it is excepted under section 552.108 or confidential under other law. Section 552.103 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and is therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); see also Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Thus, the department may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure, we conclude the department must release the submitted information to the requestor.¹

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full

¹ We note, however, that the submitted documents contain information that is confidential with respect to the general public. See Gov't Code § 552.023 (person's authorized representative has special right of access to information that is excepted from public disclosure under laws intended to protect person's privacy interest as subject of the information); see also Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when person asks governmental body for information concerning the person himself or herself). Thus, in the event the department receives another request for this information from someone other than this requestor or his authorized representative, the department must ask this office for a decision whether the information is subject to public disclosure.

benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. Id. § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. Id. § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. Id. § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. Id. § 552.321(a); Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

David R. Saldivar

Assistant Attorney General

Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ms. Melissa L. Barloco - Page 4

Ref: ID# 196303

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Robert Amboree

Afro-American Sheriff's Deputy League

3333 Fannin Street, Suite 103-A

Houston, Texas 77004

(w/o enclosures)